THE PATRIOT

No. 20.—Vol. II. 22 JUNE, 1922. PRICE SIXPENCE.

Registered at the G.P.O. as a Newspaper.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
The Cause of the Die-Hards	1
Trade Union Corruption	2
Notes of the Week	3
Revolutionary Portraits—No. VI.	5
Rutenberg's Past	6
The Facisti	7
A German View of Rathenau	8
Letters of a Patriot—No. XIV.	8
The Outlook in Ireland	9
The Schools as the Nursery of Revolution	11
The Red Organisation	11
A Book to be Read: "The Mercy of Allah"	12
Berlin Gets Soviet Press	12
Ammunition for Anti-Revolutionists	12
The German Bolshevik Conspiracy—No. X.	13
Correspondence:—"Are you a Loyalist?"	14
Our American Letter	14
A Politician with a Past	15

All communications for the Editor or Manager to be addressed to—The Boswell Printing and Publishing Co., Ltd., 2, Whitefriars Street, E.C.4.

LIBRARY NOV UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

THE CAUSE OF THE DIE-HARDS.

The *Morning Post* has appealed to its readers on behalf of the group of members of the House of Commons usually called the Die-Hards, and within a week the public have subscribed a large sum of money, which looks as if it would reach £10,000, mostly in the form of small subscriptions. The large number of people subscribing, and the earnest tone of the letters quoted in the newspaper, show that there is a great force of public opinion behind this movement—the more especially when we remember that the appeal is made at a time when trade is so terribly bad and taxation so abnormally heavy that people need every penny they possess, and cannot be in a mood to part with it lightly. We might, therefore, call this appeal and its result a real demonstration—But of what? And for what?

Let us look back a little. When the Great War was forced upon this country it took by surprise a Government which had made no preparations to meet it, but, on the contrary, had neglected every wise precaution and every true principle of national defence. Let us give a few examples. It had abandoned the Cawdor programme of four capital ships a year. It had stopped the building of Rosyth Dockyard, the only naval base on the East Coast. It had weakened the Entente by the Haldane negotiations. It had neglected the development of air warfare. It had reduced the Army by the Haldane reforms. In particular, it had reduced the artillery. It had opposed Lord Roberts's policy of National Service. It had gone to The Hague Conference, and, against the advice of competent students of war, it had accepted a code which disabled our fleet from using England's most powerful weapon—a naval blockade. It had reduced the royal arsenals and dismissed skilled workmen. It had in all these and other ways conveyed to Germany the impression that it meant to remain neutral, and in the crisis of July, 1914, it had displayed such weakness and vacillation that Germany went to war upon that disastrous assumption. On these facts a self-respecting Government would have resigned in favour of the Conservative Opposition. But Mr. Asquith was not the man to resign, nor did the Conservative leaders press for his resignation.

The Conservative Party was badly led by second-rate men, who had not the wit to see nor the courage to claim their own right and title to take over the administration. Nor did they see that such a Government as Mr. Asquith's was unfitted by the very nature of the principles it held and the people who supported it to conduct a successful war. Nor did they realise that the country—as of old—looked to a Conservative Government to take over the conduct of a war—which, by tradition, had always been the true business and concern of the Conservative Party. No, the Conservative Party, conscious of its own weakness in leadership and debating power, and timid because of that inferiority, preferred to make an impossible compromise, and joined Mr. Asquith's administration on the sole condition that they should have half the places in his Government.

Their excuse that they must preserve the unity of the country was not valid. The country would have united behind the Unionist Party as giving them a fresh hope of victory and an honest and whole-hearted prosecution of the war. If the Liberals—going into Opposition—had opposed such a policy they would have been swept out of existence. For the British nation wanted only one thing—the destruction of its enemy—which it was never allowed to have.

The compromise was always bad, but it became worse rather than better when Mr. Asquith went, for Mr. Lloyd George followed a policy of pretence. He pretended a patriotic zeal; he pretended a desire for victory; he pretended an intention to destroy the enemy; in reality, he was playing a double game, as the circumstances of the peace and everything that has happened since might serve to demonstrate. It was Mr. Lloyd George who worked against a strong Navy before the war; who intrigued against Sir Edward Grey's policy; who led a deputation of financiers of the international order to demand neutrality; who opposed

the war in the Cabinet; who embraced it only when he saw it was popular; who played a double rôle at the peace, as his interview with the Paris correspondent of the *Westminster Gazette*, his negotiations with the Bolsheviks, and his hostility to Poland serve to show; and who betrayed the British cause in Ireland, in India, and in Egypt. It is fruitless to inquire why he has always followed this policy—possibly it was through ignorance, possibly through a natural bias of bitterness and perversion in the man, possibly for his own party ends and by the influence of bad advisers. No matter. Such has been his policy, and it would be folly to believe that it will ever change. It is foolish to expect figs of thistles or to persist in vain attempts to make a silk purse out of a sow's ear. There is, however, one thing to be noted. There is a certain trend or tendency in all these betrayals: they all work in the same direction—the direction which favours international finance and the German interest as against British industry and the British interest. This tendency is continuous; it was noted in the Asquith Government as it is now noted in the Coalition. It suggests a continuous hostile influence—what we have ventured to call a vein of treachery. It was against this systematic betrayal of the British people that the group calling itself the National Party made its protest during the war. That protest was courageous, but it was weak and ineffective, partly because few were really alive at that time to the evil against which it was a revolt, and partly because even those who saw the evil feared to join a movement which might divide the nation in a time of peril.

Since then the evil has become more manifest. Almost everyone now sees it. Some are puzzled by it; some hope against hope that the Government will take a turn and amend; some are bound to the Coalition by ties of place and interest. But few, indeed, are blind to the mischief against which this protest is made. Amongst these few exceptions we might number the leader of the Unionist Party—Mr. Austen Chamberlain—who might be compared to the complacent husband of a flashy wife. He is proud of her charms, and never suspects the equivocal cause of her popularity.

The Die-Hards cannot be blamed for disloyalty, for they had to face the choice. They could not be faithful to their party leader without being unfaithful to their cause and their country. Indeed, they endured a great deal against which they ought to have protested. It was not until the betrayal became flagrant and manifest, as in the case of Ireland, that they put behind them the scruples of party discipline and became in effect an Opposition. And here, it should be noted that they are the only true Opposition to Mr. Lloyd George's policy in the House of Commons. Neither the Liberals nor the Labour Party opposed the Prime Minister's surrender in Ireland or at Genoa. Their only complaint was that it came too late, and had not gone far enough. Coalition, Labour, and Liberal—they are all under the same malign and sinister influence.

The Die-Hards will be forced more and more into complete independence of their official party, and for that independence this fund is necessary. They must keep house for themselves. The best hope for the country lies—or so it seems to us—in this movement. If the Die-Hards take enough of the rank and file with them they might yet form a national and patriotic alternative to the Coalition. But to that end national statesmanship and national leadership are required. There are several great interests in the country which have chiefly been betrayed by the Coalition. One is Ireland; a second is the Services; a third is agriculture, and a fourth is British industry. The loyalists in Ireland, those attached to the Army and the Navy, those who live by the land, and those who live by British manufactures—whether master or man—have all suffered by the present Coalition, and have nothing to hope either from the Labour or the Liberal Party. If they could be rallied and ranged behind the Die-Hards we might then have a party strong enough to wrest the control of the country from that international interest (behind the Prime Minister) which, with its secret allies in revolution and subversion, is luring and seducing this country to its destruction.

TRADE UNION CORRUPTION.

The A.E.U. contribution to the destruction of British industry has been a very useful step towards the end in view; but the question must soon become acute as to whether the working men making up the membership of the militant Trade Unions are going to submit to being slaves in the hands of their political bosses. The uninterrupted succession of strikes since the Armistice has not only destroyed much of our industry, but those strikes have nearly ruined many of the guilty Trade Unions. When Mr. Frank Hodges told his supporters that they were going "to bring Capital crashing to the ground," he did not warn the passive members of his Union that their organisation might suffer the first in the crash. The financial position of many of the Trade Unions shows that this was a very important omission; and the workers have to face a heavy bill of costs. The weakening of the resources and credit of the Unions lessens the advantage of belonging to them; and in the lock-out just ended this point of view has induced many men to leave their Unions.

A case in the West of England is typical of many. An engineering works in which relations between masters and men were perfectly satisfactory, and in which the men had expressed their ignorance of what all the fuss kicked up by the A.E.U. was about, had the usual lock-out notice posted up, and was shut down. When notice was given that men could come back on the condition that managerial functions remained in the hands of the employers the men flocked in; and this meant that they were no longer members of the A.E.U. because the political bosses had not given permission. That shop has, in effect, become a non-union shop; and the Union has been correspondingly weakened in membership and in future cash subscriptions.

In many sections of the country there are movements, starting among the steady men of the different Trade Unions, against the tyranny exercised by the Socialists and Communists who direct the policy. The scandal of the use of the general funds for political purposes, and of the persecution of members who refuse to subscribe to the special political funds, has become so great that there is a stirring of the mass of the hitherto indifferent or frightened ones. The Parliamentary Labour Party, who utilise the power grasped by the political officials of the unions, and who frighten Ministers and misinform the Press on every Labour question, will, of course, do nothing to help in the purification of Trade Unionism. The Bill now before Parliament for securing some freedom to the individual members of Unions is the first sign of any real effort to resist the power of the Socialist dictators of "Labour." Conservative working men are appealing to their members of Parliament to push the Bill through; but there are signs of obstructive and delaying tactics by some in high places.

NOTES OF THE WEEK.

The Irish Coalition.

Do the Coalitionists ever read the Irish rebel Press? If they do there can be no possible excuse for their betrayal of the Loyalists. The Republican and Communist organs in Ireland are quite frank in their statements; they do not resort to the duplicity which characterises so many of the organs of Downing Street. The *Workers' Republic*—"an organ of the Third International"—in its issue of 10 June, admits that the De Valera-Collins Coalition has been formed to "enable them to present a united national front against England." This will force England "to decide immediately two questions:—(1) The reconquest of Ireland; (2) Peace with Ireland." The first will mean "a long bloody war," in which all sections of Republicans, Free Staters, Labour, and Communists "will stand up solidly to defeat the Imperial aggression of the great exploiter and robber of the world." The *Workers' Republic* does not believe that England will adopt this policy of reconquest.

> The internal position of England and the international situation, particularly in view of the non-aggression pact of Genoa, to which Lloyd George so solemnly subscribed, and the advent of the new tussle with the Russians (who wouldn't object to using England's difficulties in Ireland as their opportunity!) at The Hague—demand peace and reconstruction. The only chance of war is that the Die-Hards of the North, with Sir Henry Wilson at the head, may so compromise England that England will have to choose between rescuing these bloodthirsty White Guards from extermination by the united Irish Army or allowing them to perish—the latter she will never do. Compromise, the weapon England's masters wielded so skilfully, will solve the difficulty at the last moment, or, perhaps, a few moments after the "last minute"!

The Bolshevik View.

The *Workers' Republic*, considering the second alternative, says that England can only secure peace in Ireland "at the price of a break with the Northern Government," and by "using the Imperial troops to stamp out the Orange terrorists and incendiaries. England has to choose between holding on to Ulster as a catspaw against the rest of Ireland, or surrendering the 'bridgehead of the North' as a base against the South." It is further added that, "under the pressure of the United National Front," England will compromise, and "will go halfway with the alternatives." The compromisers in the Irish Coalition will be prepared to meet England halfway. The sinister character of the rebel movement in Ireland is revealed in the concluding paragraph of the article from which we have quoted. It reads:—

> If these elections are a prelude to war, then the Communists and all their sympathisers will fight on the side of the United National Front with all their power against English Imperialism—and their friends and affiliated sections of the Communist International throughout the world will render them all the aid and exert all their influence to secure the defeat—however small and temporary—of the Robber Power of England.

It is to this International movement of Bolshevism that the Government have surrendered Ireland. And Coalition Unionists have the impudence to ask the "Die-Hards" what they could put in the place of the present Government!

A "Red" Plot.

The *Pall Mall Gazette* is running a "stunt" on the "Reds' New War on England." It publishes extracts from secret instructions sent by Moscow to the London headquarters of the Bolshevists "for an intensive campaign among the youth of England." This exposure is very interesting, but is it quite consistent on the part of the *Pall Mall* to denounce the Bolshevists? No Coalition organ has more strongly insisted upon the recognition of the Soviet Government than the *Pall Mall*. Only a few weeks ago we quoted in THE PATRIOT its criticism of France because she would not support Mr. Lloyd George's efforts to establish diplomatic and friendly relations with the Soviet Government. Did not the *Pall Mall* tell France that if she would not co-operate with us in this attempt to placate the Russian Soviet we should be obliged to go on with this endeavour without her help? And now this exponent of the Premier's pro-Bolshevist policy is protesting in big headlines that our Moscow friends are secretly planning to corrupt the youth of the nation. It declares that these secret instructions from Moscow "are of the most sinister and far-reaching character. No stone is to be left unturned to corrupt the religion and loyalty of English boys and girls, and annex them as pawns in bringing about the 'Proletarian Revolution.'"

Can it be True?

The documents from which the *Pall Mall* quotes are "strictly confidential," but its special correspondent has seen them. We do not like to suggest that the *Pall Mall* or its special correspondents may be mistaken, but we feel bound to remind the organ that so loyally supported the Premier's negotiations with the Bolshevists and so bitterly denounced our ally France for not doing likewise, that the Soviet delegates at Genoa "solemnly"—that is the Premier's word—agreed to a Non-Aggression Pact, which included the suspension for about eight months of all hostile propaganda. This Pact was the one achievement of Mr. Lloyd George at Genoa, and the whole of the Coalition organs were enthusiastic over it. Does the *Pall Mall* now suggest that the distinguished Bolshevists whom Mr. Lloyd George entertained to lunch are not like the Irish murder gang, "Men of Honour"? Does it mean to say these gentlemen of Moscow have already broken their solemn pledge? We cannot believe it. They are just as honourable and as true to their pledges as the Irish Republicans and Communists and assassins whom His Majesty's Government delight to receive at Downing Street. We are sure the *Pall Mall* is mistaken!

The Primrose Path.

We have noted a rumour that Lord Pembroke and Montgomery, the present Chancellor of the Primrose League, is to be given a Court appointment. This follows the precedent of Lord Clarendon, the last Chancellor, who was also given a Court appointment by the Government. We hope the rumour does not explain the manner in which the Primrose League—against the sentiments of its rank and file—has been prevented from putting up a sincere and whole-hearted opposition to the policy of the Government both in Ireland and towards Russia. If Lord Pembroke does get his reward, we hope that the Duke of Sutherland, another docile supporter of the Coalition, will not be allowed to step into his shoes. The Coalition—and even the Unionist Party, under its present leadership—are the enemy of everything for which the Primrose League is supposed to stand. In the North, some of the Unionist agents are actually

working to crush out the Primrose League, and we are glad to see that in the West of England the agent of the League has the courage to express the sentiment of his rank and file. The Primrose League should join the Die-Hards and help to save the Empire from the fate now rapidly overtaking it.

The Plight of British Industry.

The plight of British industry grows worse and worse. Every week we hear of enterprises closing down and skilled workmen—the most precious possession of a country—being turned into State pensioners. The manufacturers, who had all manner of golden pledges made to them by the Government during the war, are now in peace neglected. In war their services were seen to be vital to the nation: they are no less vital in peace, but the politician has not the wit to see it. The Paris Resolutions remain—like most good resolutions—resolutions and nothing more, and Mr. Lloyd George returns to his old loves—the middleman, the international financier, the importer of German goods. These—and certain industries parasitic on Germany—are the economic forces behind the Coalition.

The National Union of Manufacturers.

In these circumstances the manufacturers feel themselves betrayed. They have, indeed, got one measure—the Safeguarding of Industries Act; but that Act has been cunningly used by the Government as a lure—a bunch of carrots in front of the donkey's nose. As far as practice is concerned, it is almost, if not quite, a dead letter. The National Union of Manufacturers—a fighting organisation (unlike the Federation of British Industries)—has been struggling to get the Act put into force, but has met with very indifferent success, and finds itself opposed at every turn by middlemen, some of whom are obviously interested in German importations.

A Conference of Manufacturers.

In such circumstances we are glad to see that the National Union of Manufacturers has called a conference, which is to be held at the Central Hall, Westminster, on Wednesday, 28 June. The Duke of Northumberland is to be one of the speakers. His Grace has always shown a thorough understanding of the greatest of all national problems—the problem of British industry. As a student of history and of war he no doubt understands that the security of a nation rests upon its productive power, and that the foundations of the British Empire rest upon its industries. Of these industries, it should not be forgotten, Agriculture is by no means the least, and if only our manufacturers and our landed interest would unite as of old they might together save the nation.

The Prince and Poincare.

The return of the Prince of Wales and the visit of M. Poincaré have this in common: they are both events which show how sound the heart of England is; how true the nation is to its friendships, its traditions, its allegiance. If the present Government had only founded itself on that magnificent spirit of the British nation, it would have shared to the full in that splendid devotion. How sad and unfortunate it is that our Prime Minister, with all his wonderful cleverness, has not been clever enough—or perhaps we should say had not been simple enough—to base his policy in all sincerity upon the spirit of the nation. The result is that the Prince of Wales has had to be sent abroad, and M. Poincaré has had to come over here for the same reason—to try to put right what the Government has put wrong. Let us hope that they have both succeeded.

Who is He?

The harmony of the annual dinner to the Rhodes Scholars at Oxford the other day was a little disturbed when the American Ambassador mentioned "the present Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs." There were cries of "Who is he?" "He is Chancellor of this University," replied Mr. Harvey. And he went on to describe Lord Curzon as "a very able, most distinguished, most unselfish, and loyal statesman." Now, to our mind, youth has this superiority over age: it may have less wisdom, but it has also less respect for those conventions which kill truth, as ivy kills the tree. Lor dCurzon is ill: we regret it, but we should regret it more if he had not so obliterated himself in his subservience to the Prime Minister that the Foreign Office has ceased to count.

Our Foreign Policy.

The Prime Minister has long directed the foreign policy of this country. He has directed it disastrously; he has played into the hands both of the Germans and the Bolshevists. In Asia Minor he has brought the British name into contempt; in France he is called "Tartuffe"; in the United States he is regarded by the Republican Party—who are the natural friends of England—as their enemy and the ally of their opponents. All over the world he has destroyed the traditions and the reputation of British foreign policy. And Lord Curzon, who is not an ignorant man, and ought to know better, has acquiesced. Why?

Lord Balfour's Cynicism.

Lord Balfour has now succeeded Lord Curzon. Lord Balfour also knows better. But he is old, and age has increased a natural indolence. It has also increased a natural cynicism. Lord Balfour might have saved Ireland. If Lord Balfour and Lord Curzon had stood together and fought Mr. Lloyd George, the Prime Minister could not have betrayed the Loyalists in Ireland. Nor could he have surrendered to the Bolshevists at Genoa. Nor could he have jobbed his disastrous friend Mr. Montagu into the India Office. In all these cases Lord Balfour and Lord Curzon sinned against the light—which is the worst sort of sin, to our mind.

German or Jew.

Herr Kurt Kerlen, who wrote to THE PATRIOT some weeks ago to assert, on the authority of Ludendorff, that Mr. Edgar Sisson's report was a fabrication, continued the controversy in the *Morning Post*. His extremely interesting articles, of which we give an extract in another column, were directed to prove that the Jew, and not the German, is the real author of the Bolshevist Revolution in Russia. and that the German Jew now governs Germany in the interests not of the Germans, but of the Jews. This thesis was very ably handled by Mrs. Webster in her reply to Kerlen, and for our part we maintain an open mind on the subject. It seems to us probable, on such evidence as we have seen—and we admit that it is not complete—that in Russia the German used the Jew and the Jew used the German, each for his own ends. There is evidence, for example, that the German Minister in Russia before the war was concerned in the Russian Revolutionary movement; and there is evidence also that Herr Rathenau, the head of the A.E.G., and now German Foreign Minister, is deeply concerned in—and is seeking to profit by—the Bolshevist exploitation of Russia If the pan-Germans and Jewish capitalism were really at loggerheads we might hope to hear the truth. But we have no evidence that Kurt Kerlen is in the secrets of the pan-German conspirators

REVOLUTIONARY PORTRAITS.—VI.

THE MARQUIS DE SADE.

By NESTA H. WEBSTER.

Few people in this country probably realise that it was to "the glorious Revolution" the world owed the liberation of that victim of despotism, the Marquis de Sade.

Donatien Alphonse François, Comte de Sade—though always known under the title of Marquis—was born in Paris in 1740 of an old and honourable family of Provence, claiming amongst its ancestors Petrarch's inamorata, Laura de Noves, who became the wife of Hugues de Sade. It is impossible to discover any hereditary taint to account for the tendencies of the famous Marquis; he was brought up moreover in the best principles and early taught to sympathise with the poor and helpless. But after finishing his education at the College of Louis le Grand—whence he passed into the army—he burst upon the world as a "fanatic of vice."

At the age of twenty-three he had married Mlle. Renée de Montreuil, but from the outset made no pretence of fidelity. His little house at Arcueil served as a rendezvous for dissolute women of all classes, and it was there that his "sadic" propensities first became apparent. The subjects of his "experiments" were drawn from the poorest class, whom he regarded as adequately compensated by gifts of money. But the Old Régime entertained a prejudice against these diversions, and de Sade was imprisoned by order of the King at Vincennes.

Immediately on his release the Marquis resumed his life of "pleasure," but since it is his rôle as a revolutionary with which we are concerned, we need not follow him through his exploits of the next few years. Suffice it to say that an atrocious outrage committed on a poor woman, suggestive of the Chinese torture of "the hundred cuts," led to another period of imprisonment. But the climax was reached when, after being again released, he took part in a revel at Marseilles, where he distributed doctored chocolates amongst the guests, several of whom died from the results. De Sade was then condemned to death for poisoning and unnatural vices, but he succeeded in eloping with his sister-in-law to Italy. In 1777 he was, however, captured and finally re-incarcerated at Vincennes.

It was then that the Marquis discovered that he had a common cause with "the people," oppressed like himself by autocracy, and ideas of "Liberalism" began to germinate in his mind. From the point of view of the psychologist it is from this moment he becomes interesting. Hitherto he had shown himself merely a loathsome criminal, but after his transfer to the Bastille in 1784 we find him reducing his ideas to a system and "seeking in antiquity and modern times precedents and excuses for his disorders." With the aid of these researches, he succeeded in evolving a sort of "philosophy of vice," which he incorporated in two novels, "Aline et Valcour" and "Justine." The theme of these books—which I believe no longer exist, at any rate in this country—has thus been summed up by one of his biographers:—

> "It is nothing but bleeding corpses, infants torn from their mothers' arms, young women slaughtered at the end of an orgy, goblets filled with blood and wine, unheard-of tortures, blows with sticks, horrible flagellations. Cauldrons are lit, flogging horses set up, skulls smashed in, men are stripped of their steaming skins, people scream, swear, blaspheme, bite themselves, tear their hearts from their breasts, and so on throughout twelve or fifteen volumes without end. . . . Oh! what an indefatigable scoundrel!"

All this would appear at first sight to be merely the ravings of a criminal lunatic. But there is nevertheless some method in the madness, some affinity with the "philosophical" ideas current at the time. For, as another of de Sade's biographers has observed, in this book "Justine": "Morals, laws, nature, religion, humanity are outraged and violated in the most infamous manner, and the most monstrous crimes are set up as a principle (érigés en principe)." Was not this the precise system of the Illuminati and their followers, the Jacobins? If we refer back to the words of the judge at Babeuf's trial, quoted in the first article of this series, we shall find exactly the same phrase employed in describing the doctrine of the race of men to which the Revolution had given birth: "The most frightful side of their perversity is that they have unanimously set up as a principle (érigé en principe) pillage, brigandage, and assassination." De Sade then had merely anticipated this system by four years, for not only did he preach murder and debauchery, but "theft, parricide, sacrilege, the profanation of tombs"—in a word, the exact programme of the Terror.

Naturally the first mutterings of the storm were greeted with transports by the prisoner at the Bastille, and through his window, which looked out on the Faubourg St. Antoine, de Sade, using a tin funnel as a megaphone, called the surrounding population to his rescue. But a few days before the siege of the château he became so violent that it was found necessary to remove him to the lunatic asylum at Charenton. The Marquis was, however, quite sane enough to follow the course of public events with interest, and thus apostrophised the "glorious dawn" of revolution:—

> Oh, France . . . the energy of thy citizens will soon break the sceptre of despotism and tyranny by crushing at thy feet the scoundrels who serve one and the other; thou wilt feel that a people free by nature and genius must only be governed by itself!

De Sade was in fact now "impregnated with humanitarian ideas" and deeply stirred by the people's wrongs. But the people did not reciprocate his sympathy, and in the following year proceeded to pillage and burn his château of La Coste. If the people had made the Revolution, the Marquis would certainly himself have fallen a victim to their rage, and the most gigantic irony of that burlesque though tragic epoch would have been avoided. As it was, this atrocious monster, guilty of every crime it is possible to conceive, and justly incarcerated by the royal authority for thirteen years, was liberated from Charenton on 17 March, 1790, as a victim of "lettres de cachet." But the climax of the farce is yet to come. On 2 September, 1792, De Sade was elected secretary to the popular society of the

Section des Piques to which Robespierre belonged. Revolutionary writers are hard put to it to explain this preposterous appointment; Michelet, drawing, as usual, on his fertile imagination, weaves a whole story round the incident—De Sade presented himself at the Section when everyone was occupied about the massacres in the prisons, few members were present, no one knew exactly who he was, he had a gentle air, and so they gave him a pen, and the thing was done. All this is too absurd. De Sade was probably the most notorious criminal of his day, and even if the members present did not remember him, why did not the more responsible ones eject him the moment they returned? The truth is, of course, that the revolutionaries cared nothing about the character of the men they worked with.

The citoyen Sade, as he henceforth called himself, seems to have played only a minor part in the régime of the Terror; one of his biographers suggests that after all the horrible deaths he had invented the guillotine was too mild for him. He should have gone to the provinces to see "Justine" in operation. But there was yet in Paris one person who embodied his ideal—Marat, "the friend of the people," to whom De Sade dedicated this impassioned verse after his death at the hands of Charlotte Corday:—

"Du vrai républicain unique et chère idole,
De ta perte, Marat, ton image console;
Que chérit un grand homme adopte ses vertus,
Les cendres de Scévole ont fait naître Brutus."

The anti-religious campaign that began in the autumn of the same year provided a congeniai field for De Sade's activities. Atheism had always found in him an enthusiastic supporter, and on November 15 he formed one of a deputation from the Section des Piques to present an address he had composed to the Convention demanding the inauguration of the Cult of Reason in all the churches—"the reign of philosophy has just annihilated that of imposture; at last man is enlightened. . . . Reason has replaced Mary in our temples," etc. I have quoted elsewhere the further blasphemies of this harangue, which need not be repeated here. But although received with acclamations by the Convention, which ordered it to be forwarded to the Committee of Public Instruction, revolutionary chroniclers discreetly keep the episode dark, and the *Moniteur* omits it from its report of the séance.

De Sade then devoted himself to two projects he hoped to persuade the revolutionary government to adopt; these were the institution of State brothels and of gladiatorial combats. But in spite of all his "energy in the art of revolution," the citoyen Sade was finally accused of moderation and thrown once more into prison. Never once, however, were his many crimes brought up against him by the revolutionaries, and this man, who deserved a hundred deaths, triumphantly survived the Terror and continued to pour forth his infamous imaginings under the Directory. In a sequel to "Justine," called "Juliette," fresh atrocities are described—hangings, dissections, cannibalism; an ogre seven feet high regales his guests on "salmis de femme de chambre." The Directory, which delighted in him, took no action, but Napoleon showed himself less indulgent, and a further book of orgies, published in 1800, led to his re-incarceration at Charenton and finally at Bicêtre. An old man now and of enormous corpulence, with his beautiful white hair, his gentle voice and exquisite politeness, he presented the appearance of an ideal grandfather, and was immensely popular with his fellow criminals, who looked up to him as a sort of king of crime. Moving amongst them freely, he found much pleasure in indoctrinating them with his horrible ideas, so that the madmen became madder and the idiots more idiotic as they listened to him.

De Sade remained infamous to the end, and died peacefully at the age of seventy-five. The doctors seized upon his skull, hoping to find abnormal convolutions, but it proved to be remarkable for nothing but the bumps of maternal affection and love for children. There appears, indeed, to be no proof that he was mad, but simply a monster of vice. Revolutionary writers, anxious to dissociate him from the Revolution, describe him as a product of the Old Régime. But if such creatures can only spring from a corrupt aristocracy, how are we to account for Michel Bloch, the diamond merchant of Paris, who revived De Sade's "experiments" in 1891? And what about Landru?

The truth is that human monsters have always existed in every country and every age, but the Old Régime kept them under lock and key, whilst the Revolution loosed them on the world.

This article appears without an illustration, as no portrait of the Marquis de Sade has been preserved which can be regarded as authentic.

RUTENBERG'S PAST.

THE MURDER OF FATHER GAPON.

The Jewish capitalist Rutenberg was once a Revolutionary, and by his own confession lured Father Gapon to his death in 1906. His story is fully told in the *Times* of 20 June, which quotes Rutenberg's own story of the crime from a revolutionary journal. After telling how he lured Gapon into a cottage and of their alleged conversation there, Rutenberg continues:—

The things the workmen had heard whilst standing behind the door had exceeded their expectations. They had been waiting for me to let them in. Now they did not come out, but leapt out and jumped on Gapon with a groan: "Aa-a-a-a." They seized him. Gapon shouted "Martin!" but saw the face of a workman he knew, and understood everything. They dragged him into the small room. He begged:

"Comrades! Dear Comrades! Don't, don't!"

"We are no comrades of yours! Shut up!"

The workmen were binding him, and he was struggling desperately.

"Comrades! What you have heard is all untrue!" he said, and tried to scream.

"We know. Shut up!"

* * *

It was all quite obvious. Gapon was a traitor, a provocateur who had squandered the workmen's money. He had defiled the honour and the memory of the Comrades who had fallen on 9 January. Gapon must be executed. He was allowed a last word before his death. He asked that he be spared for the sake of his past.

"You have no past. You have thrown it to the feet of dirty detectives," said one of those present.

* * *

Gapon was hanged at 7 p.m. on 28 March, 1906.

I was not present at the execution. I went upstairs only when I was told that Gapon was dead. I saw him hanging on the peg with a noose round his neck. He was left hanging on that peg. They only removed the ropes from his hands and covered him with his coat.

* * *

Gapon dead body was only discovered two months afterwards.

THE FACISTI.

Though the Facisti in Italy may seem to be entering on paths remote from the original purpose for which it was instituted, and though, as some think, it runs a danger of allowing itself to be controlled by unscrupulous forces as hostile to the true interests of Italy as those which it was originally mobilised to defeat, yet there is no doubt of the sincere patriotism of the mass of its rank and file. After the sufferings through which their country had passed, and the sacrifices which she had made during four years of bitter war, the mass of patriotic, hard-working, and self-respecting Italians saw the imminent danger of all these being rendered nugatory and their beloved country, their own personal welfare, and the lives of themselves and their families faced with utter ruin and disaster by the waves of Bolshevism and Socialism, with which they were menaced after the signature of the Peace of Versailles. After enduring a long series of political strikes which struck at every industry, every public service, and every comfort and amenity of life, this mass of respectable, self-respecting, and patriotic Italians determined to end an intolerable situation which their Governments were apparently too feeble to control by normal and constitutional means. They fought and they succeeded, and whatever indiscretions they may be led into subsequently, it is no more than stating a fact to say that at the time they saved their country.

On 7 December, 1921, the Honourable Signor Bonomi, the Prime Minister, expressed himself in Parliament as follows on the Facisti :—

"This is my frank opinion on the Facisti Movement. It started as an anti-revolutionary reaction; one must go back to 1919-1920 to be able to understand how this reaction could arise. The Socialistic movement in this country was suddenly influenced by new adherents, who exploited the sufferings produced by the war to give the movement a revolutionary tendency. At the time, extraordinary news was arriving from Russia: the 'bourgeoisie' had fallen, the despotic power of the Tsar had disappeared, and with it the greatest empire of Europe; the proletariat had taken the government into its own hands; it had instituted the dictatorship of the people; it was preparing large armies for the conquest of the West. The Russian myth overcame all Socialist action, and Socialism was overpowered by doctrines of violence. The old Socialism which had trusted in propaganda and organisation of the working classes, that Socialism which I myself have preached as an element and leaven of the new fortunes of our country, because it represented the working class elements, was blinded and carried away by doctrines of violence in the vain hope of a revolutionary miracle.

"In the Socialist Congress the necessity of violence was openly advocated. The proletariat thought that it was on the eve of a revolutionary movement which would bring about the 'Dictatorship of the People'."

"It was then that the uniform of the Italian soldier, that uniform that on the Carso and on the Alps was the sign and symbol of our Fatherland, and which had covered itself with glory, was insulted in the streets and squares. It was then that all the mourning, all the sorrows, all the sufferings of the war were artificially reawakened, that the sufferers might be driven to cry out against the *uselessness* of our sacrifices, the *uselessness* of our victory.

"*Then* the anti-revolutionary reaction was born and so the Facisti came into existence, and its unexpected success, its rapid extension, is due to the instinct of self-preservation of the Italian people.

"Unnerved and frightened by violence, the State had almost lost all vitality. It sufficed that a new violence should oppose the older one for the newer to be hailed as a liberator, and from this diagnosis of events there is a political deduction that I must affirm before Parliament—in all this period the State was practically absent and overpowered, not from lack of men, but by the necessity of conditions, and the country, finding itself unable to gather strength and vitality round the organs of the State, took courage and rallied to its own defence round the banners of the 'Fasci di combattimento'."

This speech, which, coming from a speaker who is himself a Socialist (Signor Bonomi is a Reformist Socialist), has a greatly added value, clearly established the moral position of the Facisti toward the nation. It can easily be realised how this movement, which brought together the most salient personalities of the war (it included 90,000 ex-soldiers, possessing 21 gold medals for valour in the field, 1,011 silver, and 4,845 bronze medals of the same distinction), although only represented in Parliament by a small group of 34 deputies, had so great an influence as entirely to alter the aspect of the House. The extreme Left, violent and aggressive as it was, suddenly found itself face to fact with a resolute Right which was fully determined to resist any attempt to intimidate or to bully it. The very same Socialists who had maintained the legitimacy of using violence as a means towards the attainment of power, now protested that in future they intended to keep within constitutional limits, and even went so far as to ask that the forces of the State (which they had wished to overthrow but a short time before) might be called out in their defence.

Now it is proposed that the "Fasci di Combattimento," having achieved their original purpose of saving their country from the forces of anarchy without and of treason within, and of regaining security and liberty for themselves and their fellow countrymen, should become a "National Party" to "assist the nation by an intense action of rejuvenation." And amongst their fundamental theories are the following: The value and the social necessity of religious ideals; class collaboration as opposed to class antagonism; that national interests shall be placed before and above any private interest. It will endeavour to keep the Labour movement free from revolutionary tendencies, and for this purpose has organised the "Camera Italiana del Lavore" as antagonistic to the revolutionary "Camera del Lavore" and groups of railway, postal and telephone employees, seamen, engineers, business people, etc., in opposition to revolutionary influences, and to resist any forms of Socialism, Nationalism, or Municipalisation which they hold will end in bankruptcy. In agriculture they believe in the wisdom of the Roman laws, which decreed that, whenever possible, the peasant should be aided to own the land he tills in order that he may become a good citizen and a good soldier, whilst insisting on every means that will lead towards a maximum of production.

So far, the new "Partito Nazionale Facista" includes 3,000 sections distributed over all Italy with over 320,000 members, whilst various corpora-

tions of genuinely popular character, and including some 250,000 members, are auxiliary to the movement. These federated corporations have their headquarters in Rome, the Union of Industry and Commerce in Milan, of seamen in Genoa, of agriculture and labour in Bologna, and of employees generally and members of the theatrical profession in Rome. Railwaymen have a further headquarters in Bologna, and the Professional and Middle Classes Union in Naples, whilst co-operative stores and unions have been established throughout the country. In one region alone the peasants have more than 100 co-operative stores, and all these federations, corporations and other bodies are united on a genuinely National Programme.

It remains to be seen whether the success which was gained by the "Fasci di Combattimento" will also be attained by the "Partito Nazionale." But if they hold fast to their doctrines—that men have not only *rights* but also *duties*, that service given to the nation means service given to each individual, and that the interests of the nation are the interests of all, with the same courage and sincerity that they showed in their early days, and if they resist following false or unattainable gods, they are bound to occupy a dominant position in the national life of their country.

A GERMAN VIEW OF RATHENAU.

As we state in another column, our publication of extracts from Mr. Edgar Sisson's report has led to a very interesting controversy between the German writer Herr Kurt Kerlen and Mrs. Webster in the *Morning Post*. The following extract from Kerlen's second article gives a very interesting German view of Rathenau, Germany's present Foreign Minister, and his relations with the Bolshevists:—

If Mr. H. G. Wells has demanded an international trust as the only means of saving Russia, the Genoa Conference has revealed that this trust has been existing all along, and that The Hague has been chosen only for another pronunciamento of its board of directors. Deutsch—whom Mrs. Webster also mentions as having demanded a great international syndicate—is the Jewish general manager of that super-capitalistic concern, of which the present "German" Minister for Foreign Affairs, Walther Rathenau, is the president. This concern controlled in 1914 already one whole third of all industrial capital invested in Germany! This Jew Rathenau—whilst he was still the confidential adviser of the ex-Kaiser—published at Christmas, 1917, a book, "The New Economy," in which he wrote, fully knowing what was going to happen some ten months later:—

"For *US* it is not a question of a Western or any other democracy, nor of Parliamentary rule or something similar. True democracy, government by the people, has never existed anywhere, except perhaps in the short days of revolution. Everywhere in the world persons do reign, and the only question is: a State of Castes or a State of the People. THE STATE OF THE PEOPLE WILL COME, in spite of its enemies and of those who drivel about a special German freedom and prove it, too!" (Capital letters by author.)

The same Jew, Rathenau, wrote that all history would have lost its sense if William II. had entered Berlin victorious by the Brandenburg Gate; and he is the originator and designer of the economical plans after which now Lenin is shaping the Soviet economics.

LETTERS OF A PATRIOT—XIV.

Sir,—The response to the appeal of the *Morning Post* for funds to support the activities of the Die-hards is a manifest encouragement to all those who believe Conservatism can be restored, and that patriotism is not dead. No time could be more unfavourable than the present for the collection of cash; and it is evident that most of the subscribers to this new call exhibit self-sacrifice in giving anything at all when incomes are reduced and outlays are expanded. Those who have already helped the fund to reach a substantial figure are drawn from one small section of the people—the readers of the *Morning Post*—and there are great numbers who would be equally moved to help if they had happened to see the appeal; but there are still greater numbers whose hearts would approve of the objects and principles of the Die-hards if their ears had not been stopped by the cotton-wool contents of their daily papers. In this age it costs money to make any loud political noise; and, while the total amount already subscribed is small compared with the official Conservative Party funds, it is substantial enough to promise the production of such a volume of sound when the next election is in sight as will ensure some attention to the demands of the insurgents, even before the election. It must be remembered that no such great sum of money is necessary as if a new party had to be formed, with a new programme to be made known to the country; but the work to be done is simply the creation of a clear voice for the already converted within the existing party.

The latest developments in the Irish negotiations can be shown to afford gratifying confirmation to patriots of the soundness of their creed as to first principles of government. On the publication of the Pact between Collins and De Valera, our Ministers suddenly developed a backbone; and the Press had handed out to them a large supply of adjectives like "grave" and "serious" to be used on the general situation; while Ulster was no longer referred to as the only obstacle to peace, but stood in the limelight as a sacred trust to be respected. Furthermore, troops were moved against the active invaders of that trust; and the newspapers announced that nothing less than the original Treaty terms would be accepted by the now resolute English people. Mr. Collins could not at first believe his eyes and ears on these signs of insubordination of our Ministers, so he promptly threatened to call for an inquiry into the raid by British troops on the half-sovereign State of Southern Ireland. But Britain stood unshaken; and now everything is lovely, and the Treaty, and the new elastic-sided Oath, and a sort of election are all accepted in accordance with the requirements of Downing Street.

This little experience drives home the truth that the governors of a great Empire cannot protect its interests and integrity unless they possess some moral and physical courage. The present lop-sided Coalition has shown in many instances that it suffers from three fatal weaknesses—Funk, Fear, and Fright—and this, too, in times when enemies of the Empire, at home and abroad, are more numerous and daring than ever before. There is some comfort to be drawn from the latest Irish incident, for it has demonstrated the fact that, although the public are easily doped and are apparently quite apathetic in consequence, they can be very quickly aroused if plain truths are tumbled out before them in their newspapers, and the previously hidden dangers become clear in the daylight.—Yours faithfully, A. P.

THE OUTLOOK IN IRELAND.

ENGLISH OPTIMISM IN THE CONSTITUTION IS NOT SHARED IN IRELAND.

Though the Conferences in London may have warded off an immediate outbreak and enabled His Majesty's Government to postpone a decision on the recognition of a Republic, the fundamental facts are unchanged, and the Pact, even if a Republic is not the immediate result, brings nearer the aim common to both parties, an independent Ireland. The events of the last six months prove that it is not Conferences in London that matter. What is of importance is the acceptance in Ireland of the results of the Conferences, and there is no guarantee that the present agreement will be recognised by the Republicans or the "gunmen" or that the new Government will have any more power to enforce its authority than had the Provisional Government. The admission of the so-called Southern Unionists to the Conference would alone make acceptance doubtful. The idea that the Free State rested on loyalist support had already given strength to the Republicans, and the principle of safeguards for minorities will only increase this tendency. Besides the bulk of Unionist and loyalist opinion, which the so-called representatives in London have no claim whatever to represent, repudiates the idea of what will be called a favoured position for the Protestant Ascendancy. They merely claim the elementary rights of British Subjects, a strong and impartial administration of justice, which will enable them to live in security on their own merits. That is all they want, and despite paper safeguards they see no chance of getting it.

What the Republicans Think.

The apparent surrender of the Irish Delegates on the draft Constitution is not of material importance. What is of importance is the attitude of the Republicans and quasi-Republicans, or those who support the Treaty as a means of attaining a Republic, towards it. From the first it has been argued that the Treaty entitled the Free State to declare a virtually Republican Constitution, and this contention undoubtedly brought over adherents to the pro-Treaty party. If, then, at the first sign of opposition from the British Cabinet, the Irish Delegates give way and permit alterations in their draft, which was presumably of a strong Republican tendency, the acceptance of that Constitution in Ireland in its final form, namely, "the form it shall have when the British have finished mauling it," becomes a matter of very serious doubt. The Republican view, that "the very fact that an Irish Constitution has to be submitted to the Government of any other country for approval is a denial of Irish Sovereignty, and the acceptance of such a Constitution by any section of Irishmen will be a submission on the part of that section to the sovereignty of England over Ireland," will probably prevail, and even if it does not, the discussions will be long and bitter, and will probably paralyze any effective measures for peace and order. It is generally believed that the submission is only apparent in the hopes of securing the evacuation of the large British garrison which, as Mr. Churchill disclosed, remained in Dublin for service in case a Republic was declared. If and when this large force is removed, the last vestige of British authority is gone, the last hope of protection for the loyalists has vanished, and then the real truth can be revealed.

The Elections.

No very great interest is taken in the elections; indignation has been expressed in some quarters that the country was not given an opportunity of a free and open expression of opinion on the Treaty, but while the general view remains unchanged that both parties in Ireland have identical aims, namely, an independent Republic, that the only difference between them lies in the means of attaining those aims, that the Pact brings nearer the realisation of that end, and that the only means of averting that Republic is strong action on the part of the British Government, it is hardly to be expected that any wide interest should be taken when the total number of independent candidates is so small as to make no real difference.

The important point is that the election is not for a Parliament as contemplated by the Free State Act, but for the third Dail, the Parliament of the Republic, bound by no oaths, but only by its allegiance to the Republic. This was made clear in a speech during the brief election campaign:—

"At present they had a sort of dual administration, portion of it looking to Dail Eireann and a portion to the Provisional Government. This must stop. When the election was over there would be only one authority in the country, and that would derive its strength from the support the people gave it."

A very pertinent question as to the meaning of the Pact was asked in the Press by one of the independent candidates:—

"How can those who have declared their intention to destroy the Free State be loyal to the Free State Government, and how can those who have declared their intention to evade the Treaty be loyal to the Government based on the Treaty?"

An answer is important, for whatever may be done for the purposes of camouflage, there will, in fact, only be a Government responsible to the Dail as the Parliament of the Republic, and the election which Mr. Churchill said was to give Mr. Griffith the opportunity of disestablishing the Republic will only, with Mr. Griffith's assent, stabilise the Republic for a further period, the length of which depends entirely on the strength or weakness of the British Government.

Election Pledges.

Extracts taken at random from the speeches of both parties on behalf of the Panel Candidates show the common determination to extort from England the recognition of a Republic:—

"Absolute independence is our goal, and it is for you to see that it is reached in the shortest possible time."

"They needed one solid phalanx not only in the Dail but in the nation in order to bring to a successful issue the work begun in 1916."

"The panel were men who had carried the banner of Irish independence so far along the road, and it would be a betrayal of the national movement to drive out of public life men who represented the national ideal."

"We intend to get everything the Treaty enables us to take, and if they were supported as loyally in the future as during the last five or six years they would yet carry the banner to complete victory."

"England still held certain rights which Ireland claimed as being entitled to, the Treaty gave back some of them, but not all, and they intended to hold what they had got until they asked for more or took more, as the case might be."

"Ireland was not going to throw away the advantages gained by the men who died for her, and there was no doubt as to the vote for the Panel Candidates.'

If the Panel Candidates, when returned, act in accordance with the principles their supporters claim for them, it seems beyond all need of further proof that the Treaty is a nullity or, at the very outside, a partial recognition on the part of England that there is justification for Ireland's claim for absolute freedom.

Fight or Surrender.

In England the Treaty has been regarded as the limit of concession, as a magnanimous act of statesmanship which was to benefit the Empire by turning an implacable foe into a grateful friend. From the Irish point of view this is sheer nonsense. The idea underlying the Pact is to unite and keep intact the forces of both parties in case the game of bluff fails and England refuses any further surrender, for it is certain that surrender of England is coming or a renewed struggle :—

"The big question was to deal finally and effectively with the old enemy England."

"The fight with England was not at an end, it would not be done while England held a foot of our territory."

"They were now united and determined to see the fight with England to a successful conclusion."

"The Coalition Government will not last long, only till we get the last ounce of our claim out of England."

"It was their duty in the face of English threats to make the nation as strong as possible and by being strong to be in such a position that these threats could not be persisted in."

If it was intended to accept and work the Treaty honourably, why is England still to be regarded as an enemy? The only inference that can be drawn is that the Panel Candidates, the question of the Treaty aud everything arising out of it not being an issue at the election, will be bound to advance towards the ideal of complete separation from the Empire, whether this is to be attained through the Treaty or in opposition to it. All the talk about stable conditions, suppression of disorder, the state of chaos into which the country has quite unnecessarily been allowed to sink, is mere moonshine carefully planned to hoodwink the British authorities into yielding to the real design, on the plea that further concessions are preferable to such a state of chaos and anarchy within the Empire.

The Only Reality.

"In most ways the elections are a fraud, in one aspect only do they touch reality, and that is on the question of a united national front against Britain. To accomplish such is the whole object of the present elections. England confronted with a reunited (even if only temporarily) Ireland will have to decide immediately two questions, the reconquest of Ireland or peace with Ireland."

As to the first, it is said that England's internal and international position renders war almost impossible unless she can be driven to choose between rescuing the bloodthirsty Northerners from extermination by a united Irish Army or allowing them to perish ; as to the second, the only means for her to attain peace is at the price of—

"breaking with the Northern Government and using Imperial troops to stamp out Orange terrorists and incendiaries. England has to choose between holding on to Ulster as a catspaw against the rest of Ireland or surrendering the bridgehead of the North as a base against the South."

The North and the South.

It is this question of the Southern attitude towards the North that raises the most serious difficulties. All parties in the South—Free State, Republican, and those Southern Unionists summoned to deliberations in London, but not the general body of Unionist opinion in the South, which is loyal to the North—is strongly anti-partitionist; in fact, Ulster must be brought in with the rest of Ireland by fair means or foul, and one of the most important objects of the Pact was to effect an enforced union of the whole country, whether by agreement or conquest. Yet the Pettigo-Belleek incidents show that the Imperial authorities mean to adopt, on behalf of the North, methods which, had they been employed last year in the South, would have speedily reduced Sinn Fein to abject submission and saved the present danger and anxiety from repeated crises and conferences. As the union of the North is almost essential to the success of the proposed Republic, attempts must and will be made to induce the Government to abandon the North to its fate. Yet if Great Britain was in honour bound to stand by Belgium, she is under a still greater obligation to support Ulster, and, in supporting Ulster, she is maintaining one of the strongest possible barriers against the creation of an Irish Republic, and is affording some, though it is feared but a slight degree of, support to the loyalists all over Southern Ireland.

The Massacre Continues.

In the meantime the campaign against Protestants and loyalists continues unchecked. In Donegal loyalist farmers are ruthlessly plundered by hordes of I.R.A. ; in towns in the West, rifles and even machine-guns were used against ex-R.I.C. men and their families ; from various parts these men have been driven away ; in another town the windows of every Protestant shopkeeper were broken and many persons were ordered out of the country ; expulsions of loyalists are commonly reported from all parts of the South, and the houses of Protestants are being searched for arms by both Free State and Republicans. Yet no steps are taken by either the Government in Ireland or the Imperial Government to check this campaign. Even if the Treaty is strictly carried out, it is hard to see how the honour of Great Britain can remain unstained, in carrying through a settlement which involves the permanent exile from their native country of many thousands of persons for no other reason than their determined loyalty to the Crown and Empire.

Against England.

In Irish history events always repeat themselves, and what is taking place at present bears a very close analogy to the events of the years preceding 1690, when Tirconnell was nominally holding the country in the interests of King James II., but was in reality planning the establishment of an independent monarchy in the event of the failure of the King's plans. Then, as now, the disarming, confiscation, and extermination of the Protestant and loyalist population was the first necessary step, and was carried out in much the same way as now. Then the result was the Battle of the Boyne and the reconquest of the country ; it remains to be seen what the result of the present campaign will be, but the general expectation is that there will be a surrender on plausible grounds to the Republic. In both periods the measures taken in Ireland were directed solely against England ; then to enable King James to regain his kingdom ; now as part of a world-wide movement against British Imperialism, in which "the affiliated sections of the Communist International throughout the world will render the Republicans all aid and exert all their influence to secure a defeat, however small and temporary, of the Robber Power of England."

THE SCHOOLS AS THE NURSERY OF REVOLUTION.

The general public are at a loss to understand how the tenets of Communism and Bolshevism are being propagated among us; we hear men loudly proclaiming Communism and Bolshevism in our public parks and squares and at the street corners, but they speak to grown-ups for the most part; but when one hears boys and girls from our Council schools declaring themselves Communists or Socialists, we ought to ask where do these children hear of these things.

At a meeting held some time ago in the Trades Hall, Glasgow, by the advanced section of the Communistic Party the subject under discussion was: How to Attain Our End.

Among those present there were a number of assistant schoolmasters and mistresses. One of the masters, in addressing the meeting, said this: "There is no better way than to use the opportunity which is given in our schools. We can use our history, political economy, etc., to instil into the minds of our pupils the views which we hold, and I am convinced that we shall reap a rich harvest."

It was laughed at by the public in Glasgow at the time, and no one for a moment thought that in four or five years' time there would be a Labour majority in the City Council of Glasgow, or that one of the assistant masters would be the Bolshevic Consul of Russia to the city of Glasgow. Both these are accomplished facts to-day.

The same power is at work in London to-day. In parts of London, especially in the northern suburbs, I am informed that 60 per cent. of assistant masters and 40 per cent. of the assistant mistresses are either members of the Labour Party or avowed Communists. This clearly shows where the children are being corrupted.

It is a crying shame that the children are placed under men and women of this kind during the most impressionable years of their lives. The law compels the parents to send their children to the school, and the law should insist that the men and women to whom it hands over the training of the children, the men and women of to-morrow, that they are at least loyal to the country in which they earn their bread under such favourable conditions.

Bolshevism has been condemned by such leading social reformers (after investigation) as Mrs. Philip Snowden, Mr. Keeling, and Ramsay Macdonald. Mr. M. Schwartz, the American Socialist, has condemned it in the most emphatic manner.

Mr. Schwartz on January 21, 1921, said: "Bolshevism is a government of a few people for their own purposes; it is an outrage. There is no free speech in Russia, no free assembly, no free religion, and trials are carried out in secret."

I ask the public of England: Are we compelled to entrust the training of our children to men and women whose views are in agreement with the present autocratic rulers of Russia to-day?

The teachers are public servants; they are paid out of the rates which the people pay, their training at colleges is provided for them also out of rates; they receive the best remuneration of any public servants, their hours of labour (twenty-five) are shorter than any other public servant's, yet a number of these men and women are endeavouring to upset the Constitution of this country.

The parents, on the other hand, in the first place, are compelled by the law of the land to send their children to the public schools; the parents are compelled to pay the taxes by which the schools are maintained, which includes the salaries and pensions that are paid.

Have the parents no voice as to how and in what manner their children shall be trained?

In short, do the children belong to the State or to their parents?

GLYN-AP-GLYN.

THE RED ORGANISATION.

The preparations for revolution in England, in co-operation with the successful establishment of anarchy in Ireland, are very much more serious than the ill-informed British public know. The following extract from the pamphlet "The Great Conspiracy" shows the complete plans of the Red Intelligence Department:—

The *Herald* League, as already mentioned, acts as an important part of the Intelligence Branch of the Militant Movement. The News Department of the *Daily Herald* appears to have acted as the virtual headquarters of this semi-secret society, and reports from all over the country were sent to that paper. Through it liaison was kept up with the Right Wing through the Headquarters of the Labour Party at 33 and 34, Eccleston Square, while Mr. W. Mellor, Industrial Editor of the *Daily Herald*, and a member of the Executive Council of the Communist Party, acted as Chief Liaison Officer with the Left Wing. W. N. Ewer, Foreign Editor of the *Daily Herald*, and one of the Executive of the National Guilds League, was the link with that group, and was in touch with various foreign revolutionary movements through the *Daily Herald* representatives in European capitals. Thus the *Daily Herald* may be said to have formed the hub of the revolutionary movements in this country.

During the coal strike of April-June, 1921, both Wings were kept informed of every movement of troops, and of the progress of recruiting for the Defence Force, within which they had their informants. The Revolutionary Organisation in Great Britain has its spies everywhere; *Herald* League and I.L.P. scouts and runners conveyed intelligence by motor-cycle, or, as employees on the railways, by train between the different centres. In the Post Offices, Telephone Exchanges and Government Offices, the ramifications of the revolutionary intelligence system extend chiefly through members of the National Union of Clerks, the Postal Servants' Union, the Civil Services Union—all of which bodies include adherents of Socialism, Communism, or of Sinn Fein. Hence the leaders of the revolutionary movement control a vast organisation, by means of which they are kept informed of any move by the authorities which may be inimical to their plans.

On the widespread nature of the plans against England and the Empire the following is instructive:—

From the time of the Armistice, Sinn Fein at once got into closer touch with the Russian Bolshevist Government and with the revolutionary societies here. The Communist Club and the International Socialist Club in London included persons who were members not only of Sinn Fein in Ireland, but of the Clan-na-Gael and Industrial Workers of the World in America; and these persons acted as couriers between New York, London and Dublin, conveying both intelligence and funds to Sinn Fein. Some of these men had been imprisoned for sedition in America. The Socialist Labour Party and Workers' Committees of Glasgow also were in close touch both with Sinn Fein and the I.W.W., as well as with the Russian Soviet Government. John Maclean openly stated in an article that the ultimate object of the Irish fight was a Communist Republic, and "should Ireland get a Republic, the Class War will then burst out and be fought out till Irish Labour wins and establishes Communism finally again in the 'Ould Countrie.'"

J. V. Leckie, of the Communist Labour Party of Glasgow, speaking at Manchester on 4 November, 1920, said:—

"I might as well tell you my greatest ambition is the destruction of the British Empire. . . Sinn Fein and Communism will smash up the British Empire, so I say, 'Up Irishmen, Up the Irish Republic!'"

A BOOK TO BE READ.

"The Mercy of Allah." By Hilaire Belloc. (Chatto and Windus.)

Nearly twenty years ago Mr. Belloc, with his "Mr. Burden," commenced a campaign against the International Financier. In that novel, in "Mr. Clutterbuck's Election," "Pongo and the Bull," and "A Change in the Cabinet," he showed the maleficent influence which a Mr. Barnett, created Duke of Battersea, exercised on the policy of the British Empire.

Until August, 1914, it was usually thought that Mr. Belloc's stories had little or no foundation in fact. The Great War, the Little Peace, and the creation of the League of Nations, which seems to be an organ of International Finance, have, as it were, bulled Belloc's stock. It is now perceived that he was enlightening the public on matters which intimately concerned it. He had not been a Member of Parliament for nothing. His novels were designed to instruct as well as to amuse.

In "The Mercy of Allah" Mr. Belloc, while continuing his attack on International Finance, breaks new ground. His multi-millionaire is no longer a Judæo-British Peer, but a certain Mahmoud living at Bagdad "in the days of Abd-er-Rahman." To the seven nephews of his impecunious brother, a surgeon, by name El-Hakim, this Mahmoud explains the methods by which he accumulated a gigantic pile. Though the tale drags a little at times, it is, as a whole, exceedingly funny, if, at the same time—to patriots—painful reading.

Mahmoud, it appears, was, as a boy—to quote his own words—"shy, dirty, ignorant, lazy, and wilful." He grew up unacquainted with the Koran, the most Solemn Name in which he then, and ever afterwards, pronounced with an aspirate. When he was seventeen, his father handed him '100 dinars' and kicked him into the street. Later, by means of numerous petty larcenies and frauds, he acquired 1,000,000 dinars.

Hearing that the king of an island called Izmar required a loan, he crossed over with his money and lent it to the monarch at 5 per cent. The loan was secured on the Izmarian Salt Tax. Very naturally, "through the importance of my connection with the State," Mahmoud relates, "I was sworn of the [Royal] Council." In Izmar there was, apparently, no Act of Settlement prohibiting aliens sitting in its Privy Council, or, if there was one, the judges there had decided that it was impliedly repealed by some piece of subsequent legislation.

The most important member of the Izmarian Council was Tarib, the Lord Doubler, whose father had been a respected merchant in offal. Mahmoud and he became firm friends, but, alas! owing to a dearth of rice and consequent popular discontent, Tarib had to deliver a Limehouse speech against the rich, and to propose that the Salt Tax should be halved, which it promptly was. By income and super-taxes Mahmoud was gradually reduced almost to beggary, until he found himself left with less than 1,000 dinars. He was advised to bring an action against the King of Izmar for the recovery of the 1,000,000 dinars advanced. His Holiness Judge Benshaitan disallowed his claim, and, finally, he returned to the Continent with only 5 dinars.

Of Mahmoud's subsequent adventures, how, among other things, he secured for a song the site of and how he built a garden city, how he sold it for 2,000,000 gold pieces to a town council, how, with these, he migrated to the Kingdom of Dirak, started a bank, and, during a great war between Dirak and a neighbouring State, fleeced the Dirakians, the reader may learn for himself by purchasing, borrowing, or Mahmouding Mr. Belloc's book.

One fault we have to find with it. Mr. Belloc often exaggerates. For example, he makes Mahmoud, when, on one occasion, he is negotiating for the sale of a bridge to a local authority, say: "However great my services had been in the past, I was glad that they should be at the disposal of my country—*for so I called the place, having lived in it now two years and more.*"

We feel sure that a Sir Edgar Speyer would not call any place his country after so short a residence!

BERLIN GETS SOVIET PRESS.

The following appeared in the *New York World* as a special cable despatch:—

BERLIN, 20 May.—The Soviet Government is about to transfer the largest Russian publishing establishment—known as the Soviet Russian State Publishers—from Moscow to Berlin, thus bringing the number of Russian publishing houses in Berlin to eighteen.

The Soviets declare the transfer is being made for technical reasons, but the impression here is that Berlin is being transformed into a suburb of Moscow, and that Germany will soon find herself entangled in a network of Soviet propaganda as the result of the Rapallo Treaty.

AMMUNITION FOR ANTI-REVOLUTIONISTS.

In the Thirteenth Tract of the "Economic Truth Series" (Liberty and Property Defence League, 25, Victoria Street, Westminster), Mr. W. H. Mallock writes on "The Poison of Misleading Words," and points out that the vitiated use of such terms as "work," "exploitation," "the dictatorship of the proletariat," and "communism" is responsible for much of the social and economic unrest from which the world is at present suffering. Primarily and generally these words when misused produce unrest amongst the masses, not by popularising any reasoned and detailed convictions antagonistic to the existing order, but by generating amongst them a vague mood or temper which amounts to a hostile pre-judgment of it, as though this was a foregone conclusion. This, and the previous Tracts which deal with such questions as labour, capital, income, value, and landed property, are intended to supply anti-revolutionary speakers and writers with reliable material for effective propagandist work against Socialism, Bolshevism, and other disrupting and incendiary agitations which are now menacing the welfare of civilised society.

THE GERMAN - BOLSHEVIK CONSPIRACY.

A FURTHER INSTALMENT OF MR. SISSON'S REPORT.—No. X.

We give below a further instalment of the report presented by Mr. Edgar Sisson to the Public Information Committee of the American Senate. Our extracts from Mr. Sisson's report, we are glad to observe, have attracted widespread attention, and have been the cause of an extremely interesting controversy between Herr Kurt Kerlen and Mrs. Webster in the columns of the *Morning Post*. Herr Kerlen again quotes the authority of General Ludendorff for the assertion that Mr. Sisson's report is a fabrication; but upon that we have to observe that the report was carefully examined before issue by a Board of Historical Studies appointed by the American Government, and was found by them to be genuine, save for one or two documents of minor importance which were not considered proved.

DOCUMENT No. 38.

Commission for Combating the Counter Revolution and Pogroms, No. ?.

Petrograd, December 14, 1917.

Major von Boehlke:

Esteemed Comrade: I bring to your notice that our Finnish comrades, Hakhia, Pukko, and Enrot have advised the Commissar for Combating the Counter Revolution of the following facts:—

1. Between the English officers and the Finnish bourgeois organisations there are connections which cause us serious apprehension.

2. In Finland have been installed two wireless stations which are used by unknown persons who communicate in cipher.

3. Between General Kaledin and the American mission there is an undoubted communication, of which we have received exact information from your source, and, therefore, a most careful supervision of the American Embassy is necessary.

These reports must be established exactly. Our agents are helpless. Please excuse that I write on the official letter heads, but I hasten to do this, sitting here at the commission at an extraordinary meeting. Ready to service.

F. ZALKIND.

NOTE.—The written comment at the top of the letter is: "Commissar for Foreign Affairs. I request exact instructions. Schott." It is von Boehlke's question, signed with his cipher name. (See Document 5.) The letter may imply that von Boehlke had, in the opinion of his good friend Zalkind, a means of internal observation at the American Embassy.

Have photograph of letter.

DOCUMENT No. 39.

Counter Espionage at the Army Headquarters, No. 268.
(Very secret.)

January 25, 1918.

To the Commission on Combating the Counter Revolution:

The 23rd of January at the Army Headquarters, Stavka, there took place a conference, at which there participated Major von Boehlke, assigned from Petrograd. It was decided, upon the insistence of the German consultants, to send to the internal fronts the following persons, furnishing them all powers for dealing with individual counter-revolutionaries:

To the Don: Zhikhorev, Rudnev, Krogultz, and Ernest Delgau.

To the Caucasus Front: Vassili Dumbadze, Prince Machabelli, Sevastianov, and Ter-Baburin.

To the 1st Polish Corps of General Dovbor-Menitsky are assigned Dembitski, Stetkus, Zhimiitis, and Gisman.

Be so good as to take all measures for the quick assignment and the adequate furnishing of the assigned persons with money, reserve passports, and other documents.

Senior Officer: PETER MIRONOV.

NOTE.—This is an assassination order against individuals. It was not successful against the Polish general. Dembadze and Prince Machabelli were German spies implicated in the Sukhomlinoff affair and sentenced to prison, but afterwards liberated by the Bolsheviks. Lieut. Colonel Dembitski was a Bolshevik Polish officer. Baburin was an assistant chief of staff under Krilenko. The letter is endorsed: "Comrade Lunacharsky. Go and report to Comrade Zinovieff." Signature illegible.

Have photograph of letter.

DOCUMENT No. 40.

Counter Espionage at the Army Headquarters, No. 51/572.

January 19, 1918.

To the Commission for Combating the Counter Revolution:

There have been received two notes addressed to the Supreme Commander from the staffs of the Austrian and German High Commands. These notes inform the Army Headquarters [Stavka] that the organiser of the volunteer army in the Don region, General Alexieff, is in written communication with the officer personnel of the Polish legions at the front, with the view of getting the help of Polish officers in the counter-revolution. This information has been received by the Austrian agents from the Polish Bolshevik Comrade Zhuk, who played a large part at Rostov during the November and December battles. On the other side, the representative of the German Government, Count Lerchenfeldt, reports of the rapidly growing movement in Poland in favour of the bourgeois estate owners' imperialistic plan to defend with arms the greatest possible independence of Poland, with the broadening of its frontiers at the expense of Lithuania, White Russia, and Galicia.

This movement is actively supported by the popular democratic party in Warsaw, as well as Petrograd, by military organisations guided by the counter-revolutionary estate owners and the bourgeois Polish clergy.

The situation which has arisen was discussed on the 16th of January at the Stavka in the presence of Major von Boehlke, sent by the Petrograd branch of the German Intelligence Bureau, and it was there decided:

1. To take the most decisive measures, up to shooting *en masse*, against the Polish troops which have submitted to the counter-revolutionary and imperialistic propaganda.

2. To arrest General Dovbor-Menitsky.

3. To arrange a surveillance of the commanding personnel.

4. Send agitators to the Polish legions to consult regarding this the Polish revolutionary organisations known to the Committee.

5. On learning of the counter-revolutionary activity of Polish officers to immediately arrest them and send them to the Stavka at the disposal of the Counter Espionage.

6. To arrest the emissaries of General Alexieff, Staff Captain Shuravsky, and Capt. Rushitsky.

7. To request the Commission for Combating the Counter Revolution, in agreement with the German Intelligence Bureau at Petrograd, to arrange a surveillance and observation of the following institutions and persons:—

(*a*) The Military Committee.

(*b*) The Society of Friends of the Polish Soldier.

(*c*) Inter-Party Union.

(*d*) The Union of Polish Invalids.

(*e*) Members of the Polish Group of the former State Duma and Council.

(*f*) The chairman, Lednitsky, and the members of the former Committee for the Liquidation of Affairs of the Kingdom of Poland.

(*g*) Boleslav Jalovtski.

(*h*) Vladislav Grabski.

(*i*) Stanislav Shuritski.

(*j*) Roman Catholic Polish clergy.

(*k*) The Polish Treasury, through which, according to agency reports, the governments of countries allied with Russia intend, with the assistance of the New York National City Bank, to supply with monetary resources the counter-revolutionary camp.

(*l*) It is necessary to verify the private reports of several Lithuanian revolutionaries that among the Church Benevolent Funds, which are at the disposal of the Polish clergy, are the capitals of private persons who hid their money from requisition for the benefit of the State.

In case of establishment of any connection with the counter-revolution, the guilty Polish institutions are to be

liquidated, their leaders and also persons connected with the counter-revolutionary activity are to be arrested, and sent to the disposal of the Stavka.

Chief of the Counter Espionage: FEIERABEND.
Commissar: KALMANOVICH.

NOTE.—Again Germany, through Count Lerchenfeldt, was intriguing on both sides. Chiefly, however, the significance of the letter is in the thoroughness of the outlined German plan to crush the threat of armed opposition from the Polish legions of the Russian army. The troops were fired upon, as indicated. The preceding document really follows this in natural sequence. The next two further elucidate the situation for the benefit of the Poles of the outside world.

Have photograph of letter.

DOCUMENT No. 41.

Counter Espionage at the Army Headquarters, No. 461.

January 28, 1918.

To the Commission for Combating the Counter Revolution:

The Special Constituent Commission on the conflict with the Polish counter-revolutionary troops has begun its activity. All the conduct of its affairs has been located at the Counter Espionage at the Army Headquarters [Stavka], where is being collected all information on the counter-revolution on the external and internal fronts. At the commission have arrived members of the Commission for Combating the Counter Revolution, E. Miekonoshin, I. Zenzinov, Zhilinski, and from Sevastopol Comrade Tiurin. To a conference were called agents announcing their wish to be sent for conflict with the bourgeois Polish officers: Lieut.-Col. Dembitski, Boleslav Yakimovich, Roman Strievsky, Joseph Yasenovsky, and Mikhail Adamovich. All these agents are under obligation to carry the affair to the point of open insubordination of the soldiers against the officers and the arrest of the latter.

For emergency the commander-in-chief ordered to assign Nakhim Sher and Ilya Razymov for the destruction of the counter-revolutionary ringleaders among the Polish troops, and the commission recognised the possibility of declaring all Polish troops outside the law when that measure should present itself as imperative.

From Peterburg, observers announced that the Polish organisations are displaying great reserve and caution in mutual relations. There has been established, however, an unquestionable contact between the High Military Council located in Peterburg and the Polish officers and soldiers of the bourgeois estate-owning class with the counter-revolutionary Polish troops. On this matter in the Commissariat on Military Affairs, there took place on January 22 a conference of Comrades Podvoisky, Kedrov, Boretzkov, Dybenko, and Kovalsky. The Commissar on Naval Affairs announced that the sailors Trushin, Markin, Peinkaitis, and Schultz demand the dismissal of the Polish troops, and threaten, in case it is refused, assaults on the Polish legionaries in Peterburg. The commander-in-chief suggests that it might be possible to direct the rage of the sailors mentioned, and of their group, to the front against the counter-revolutionary Polish troops.

At the present time our agitation among the Polish troops is being carried on in very active fashion, and there is great hope for the disorganisation of the Polish legionaries.

Chief of Counter Espionage: FEIERABEND.
Secretary: IV. ALEXIEFF.

NOTE.—Have photograph of letter.

DOCUMENT No. 42.

Counter Espionage at the Army Headquarters, No. 21.

January 28, 1918.

To the Commission for Combating the Counter Revolution:

At the request of the commander-in-chief, in answer to your inquiry, I inform you, supplementary to the dispatch, that the funds sent with Major Bayermeister have been received here. Among the troops acting on the front against the counter-revolutionaries have been prepared several battalions for conflict with the Poles and Roumanians. We will pay 12 roubles a day, with an increased food ration. From the hired sections sent against the legionaries have been formed two companies, one from the best shots for the shooting of officer regiments, the other of Lithuanians and Letts for the spoiling of food reserves in Vitebsk. Minsk, and Mogilev governments, in the places where the Polish troops are situated. Various local peasants have also agreed to attack the regiments and exterminate them.

Commissar: G. MOSHOLOV.
Secretary: IV. ALEXIEFF.

NOTE.—These two documents show that the policy against these patriotic soldiers was one of merciless extermination, financed by German money, handed out by a German officer. Bayermeister is named in Document No. 5.

Have photograph of letter.

CORRESPONDENCE.

NOTE.—While inviting correspondence, the Editor takes no responsibility for the opinions expressed.

To the Editor.

"ARE YOU A LOYALIST?"

Sir,—I have just read with delight the excellent "Scout Laws" drawn up by the patriotic Founder of the Boy Scouts and Girl Guides—Lt.-Gen. Sir Robert Baden-Powell—a better bible for a boy I have never read.

The second law runs: "A Scout is *loyal* to the King, his country, his officers, his parents, his employers, and to those under him. He must stick to them through thick and thin, against anyone who is their enemy, or who even talks badly of them."

Surely, this is equally applicable to grown-up boys and girls. At our next election, the first and most important question to put to a Parliamentary candidate will be:—

ARE YOU A LOYALIST?

The grave issue we have to face is whether we shall choose to be governed by Loyalists who are Royalists, or by the King's enemies. It is no use blinking facts.

A sepulchral name like "Die-hards" is no name for a great Nation-Party, of which, in the opinion of so many of us, the Duke of Northumberland was born to become the leader.—Faithfully yours,

Brighton. MARK AMBIENT.

OUR AMERICAN LETTER.

WASHINGTON, June 5, 1922.

The political doctrines and ideas of Dr. Woodrow Wilson, both formulated and unformulated, have, as we have seen, been going up and down and to and fro upon the Earth, free to be made use of by "man or demon." While the mundane elements have attempted the "reconstruction of Europe" under a League of Nations according to prescribed Wilsonian principles, these are also being found equally useful by the infernal elements in the work of the "destruction of Europe."

In the United States both elements have united (for the time being, at any rate) to raise a tabernacle worthy of America's great political evangelist. Into this mansion, swept and garnished, will ultimately be gathered the diverse and potent spirits which the statesman pedagogue has generated.

Woodrow Wilson Foundation.

A drive is now in successful progress to raise "a million dollars or more" wherewith to endow the Woodrow Wilson Foundation, with "national headquarters" at 130, Nassau Street, New York City. The appeal is "issued to all who believe in those liberal and democratic principles that Woodrow Wilson has so conspicuously championed, and who wish to perpetuate the influence of America's great war leader." An "award or awards from the income of the Foundation will be made from time to time by a nationally constituted committee to the individual or group that has rendered within a specified period meritorious service to democracy, public welfare, liberal thought, or peace through justice."

The future of the Foundation may be confidently anticipated. Its fund may reach five million dollars. It will embody Dr. Wilson's manifest words into a Koran and a body of political doctrines, to which the native politically orthodox will subscribe with a sense of uplift and rectitude, whether they be Democrats or Republicans. Already Wilsonism is a tradition. No politician of either complexion dare publicly condemn a single one of his principles. Then in time there will be chairs endowed in Universities, or even whole Universities, whose object will be the inculcation of his political philosophy. Wilsonism may thus become a catholic political faith, like Free Trade in England; that is to say, it may become a school of thought which rests on the assumption of a superior attitude of mind, one that will in no wise condescend to adapt itself to the needs of the body politic, but will demand that the polity of the nation adapts itself instead to its doctrines. And the faith that was in Dr. Wilson will be in his disciples.

Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

A sample of the goods that may be produced comes from the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. This, of course, is a purely American inspiration, despite the inclusion of an occasional name like J. Ramsay MacDonald in the Advisory Council of its European organisation. The instance is its publication of a book, "A Monograph on Plebiscites," by Sarah Wambaugh, a 1,000-odd page quarto volume listed at 5 dols. Its object is to give a "list of cases

. . . in which the right to self-determination has been recognised (sic)," which means, in sane political language, a list of cases in which plebiscites have been found expedient in determining frontiers. To infer that the "recognition" of the "right of self-determination" has resulted in Plebiscites is a perversion of history. Nevertheless, this monumental work was flung at an opportune moment into the lap of the Versailles Peace Conference. In the introduction the author proceeds as though "self-determination" and "government by consent" were interchangeable ideas and principles established since the eighteenth century, and she tacitly assumes that the reader assents. Self-indulgence (or self-determination) and self-control (or self-government) are thus assumed to be the same in the domain of political ethics!

There is, of course, no reason why there should not be established a similar school of thought round the true source of real Americanism, Abraham Lincoln, a truly noble character and martyr whom the gods instructed. But it will not be done for the simple reason that there is little, conservative or subversive, in American politics that sees in "the father of his people" a factor that can be made use of to serve political ends. There is, unfortunately, no such thing as Lincolnism, which would be the true antidote in America to Wilsonism.

Action v. Reaction for Wilsonism.

But Wilsonism is not being made in America. It is being made "right now" in Europe. And as fast as it is being moulded into the forms which suit Radicals there, it flows back, on wireless waves, to the soil where it is indigenous. The American Democratic Party, and also quite other elements, such as Tammany, and the like, wave under its influence like a field of grain in the wind. This is what blows across every other day:—

"Holds our policy, hampers Europe."

"Lloyd George tells Commons it upsets balance of Reparations Board and League of Nations."

As Lloyd George has since been in touch in London with the notorious Hearst of the Yellow Press, the Tammany boss and possible Democratic aspirant for the next Presidency, Lloyd George may in the future have his opportunity of making further propaganda for the Wilsonites. Thus we may see a purely American development, the Democratic Party, led on to a forlorn hope for the ulterior purpose of disseminating un-American and subversive ideals.

At every turn one finds Wilsonism acting in Europe and reacting here. It comes into politics like a King Charles Head.

Wilsonism in Germany

In Germany Wilsonism may also be seen being made use of. The Bankers Commission proposes an "international" loan, to be subscribed to mainly by American investors. At the same moment that it is being discussed and certain terms agreed to, the Stinnes group in the Reichstag places on record a "no confidence" motion, protesting against the surrender of "the sovereign rights of the State" over the sources of revenue which it was proposed should be pledged as security. Thus, while the German Government endeavours to tap the sources of American capital, a German group in the Reichstag, which is already suspect of being "the power behind the throne," serves notice that they stand by the Wilsonian doctrine of "the sovereign right of a State to do what it likes in its own territory," as formulated by Lloyd George. Which simply means that when in actual power they will at the opportune time repudiate the pledge as being an "illegal" subversion of sovereign rights. Thus, while American finance looks over the world for opportunities to invest capital, Wilsonism stalks after it in vaulting strides to knock the security of investments into a cocked hat.

Wilsonism and Marxism.

Here is a sample of the Wilsonian ammunition which is now being used in the underground war against France:—

"I am as keenly aware, I believe, sir, as anybody can be, that the social structure rests upon the great working classes of the world, and that those working classes in the several countries of the world have, by their consciousness of community of interests, by their consciousness of community of spirit, done perhaps more than any other influence has to establish a world opinion, which is not of a continent, but is the opinion, one might say, of mankind."

These words were for the benefit of the mayor and citizens of Milan, on January 6, 1919. One has only to supply the words "capitalistic" before "structure," and "class" before "consciousness," and we have the purest Marxism. There are, of course, opportunities in this sort of stuff which a Lloyd George-Hearst combination could exploit.

SCARAB.

A POLITICIAN WITH A PAST.

Sir,—A recent issue of the *National Review* gave certain details of Mr. Lloyd George's anti-patriotism, but left out perhaps the most characteristic episode of the lot. I refer to his reading of the notorious "Morrison" letter, as officially reported in the House of Commons Parliamentary Debates for February 18, 1901.

Mr. Lloyd George quoted from the "Morrison" letter, a letter subsequently found to have been deliberately garbled by persons of the same political persuasion as himself. That false letter was read in part by the present Premier on the date given above.

Before quoting Mr. Lloyd George, the history of the Morrison letter, which formed the text of his speech, may be recalled. In 1901, a body calling itself the Peace Committee—whose membership list was hallowed with the names of a number of English clerics greedy of insult to England—showed special activity in the congenial task of circulating accusations of atrocity against the British Army. Its best achievement was the Morrison letter, purporting to be from a Canadian officer at the Front. Originally, the facts of this letter seemed scarcely to lend themselves to the sacred cause of peace and righteousness and purity. So the only thing to be done was to rearrange the facts. Some rather spirited sub-editing then took place, and all would have been well, save that by some deplorable oversight, the name of the officer was given, and the original document obtained. Meanwhile, however, the letter had earned the distinction of having been quoted in Mr. Lloyd George's speech in Parliament, his only other quotation in that speech being a text from Holy Scripture. The letter as written, and its garbled version, appear side by side:—

THE PEACE COMMITTEE'S LETTER.

"Bright and early we marched off. The Canadians, as usual, were in front with two pom-poms. Colonel King commanded the advance, and General Smith the main body."

"As I stood looking on, a woman, *the owner of a very pretty house standing in a rose garden on a side street which was being destroyed*, turned to me, and *pathetically exclaimed:* 'Oh, how can you be so cruel?' I sympathised with her and explained that it was an order."

THE REAL LETTER.

"Bright and early we marched off. The Canadians, as usual, were in front, with two pom-poms. We were bound for the Steilport valley. *When our little force used to go out in reconnaisance, and get into the rough and rocky hills overlooking the valley, the well-fed burghers would swarm out of the farms and have a lot of fun with us. That we did not have any casualties was not their fault. It was also some of them who killed two of the dragoons by dressing up in khaki, and enticing them over to a kopje where they shot them in cold blood.*"

"As I stood looking on, a woman turned to me and said: 'Oh, how can you be so cruel?' I sympathised with her and explained that it was an order. *She was a good-looking female in distress, and had quite the style of an ill-used heroine. I certainly was sorry for her, we all were, until the house began to burn, and a lot of concealed ammunition began to explode, and nearly killed some of our men.*"

The official report for February 18, 1901, contains no record of the insult offered to a British General in Mr. Lloyd George's speech. It is evident that the present Prime Minister availed himself of the privilege of revising his speech previous to its appearance in the official debates. Unfortunately for him, a similar precaution was not taken in the speech of Mr. Winston Churchill, next after it, which contains the following passage:—

"I believe that this war (the South African) has been carried on with unusual humanity and generosity. The honourable member for Carnarvon Boroughs has drawn attention to the case of one general officer, and because I know General Bruce Hamilton, whom the honourable member described as General Brute Hamilton, I feel unable to address the House without offering my testimony to the fact that in all His Majesty's Army there are few men with better feeling, more kindness of heart, or higher courage." ("Official Debates," February 18, 1901.)

Mr. Winston Churchill is now the follower of the politician whose anti-patriotism he rebuked.

RICHARD H. GLOVER.

THE PATRIOT

No. 20.—Vol. II. 22 JUNE, 1922. PRICE SIXPENCE.
REGISTERED AT THE G.P.O. AS A NEWSPAPER.

AN APPEAL TO THE NATIONAL HONOUR.

THE RESTORATION OF CLEAN GOVERNMENT.

SUPPORT THE DIE-HARDS.

Our appeal for support in the restoration of honesty in politics is addressed to all those who, irrespective of the party with which they may be associated, regard with apprehension the present condition of the national affairs. All political parties alike, together with that large proportion of the electorate which keep themselves aloof from party, are concerned in the probity of the Government and the stability of the State. Time was when the word of a British Government was as good as their bond: to-day, their word no man believes in, and they cancel their bond at will.

A Government Afraid.

It will not be denied that the first duty of a Government is to maintain intact the Dominions of his Majesty the King; to protect the persons and property of the King's subjects; and indifferently to administer justice; and in all circumstances to abide by a pledge once given.

Upon the observance of these elementary principles of public morality depends the honour of the country, in which is involved the honour of every citizen. The Coalition Government have put the honour of the country in pawn. Who, while there is yet time, will redeem it?

At the moment when the Prime Minister and his colleagues fell to treating with murderers, their feet were set upon a descent, slippery with the blood of faithful servants of the King, upon which there is no turning back. In that moment they forfeited their title to their high office, and earned the contempt of every honest man and woman.

Favouring the King's Enemies.

What is the meaning of the sinister statement reiterated by responsible persons, that at the time the infamous truce was made with the Irish rebels the forces of the Crown were at the point of finally suppressing the insurrection?

The abject surrender to the organised assassination and the Bolshevist conspiracy in Ireland coincided with the toleration of sedition in India and the abandonment of Egypt, the central strategic station of the Empire, under the threats of inciters to mob violence. These betrayals of trust coincided also with the furtive negotiations of the Prime Minister with the abominable tyranny of the Russian Soviet, the implacable enemies of British rule in every part of the world. At the same time, it has been the persistent policy of the Government, ever since the signature of the Treaty of Versailles, while professing friendship with France, to work against France in the interests of Germany.

The Dead Betrayed.

For what was the war fought and won? A part—the greatest part—of that purpose was to hold what we possessed. Is the country to stand idly by while its inheritance, so hardily gained, retained at a cost so bitter; is bartered away to the King's enemies? For that is what is happening. The excuse proffered by our cowardly rulers is that they must buy peace at any price. The country pays the price in blood and treasure; but there is no peace, nor will be. *With so much dishonour, you might have bought a little peace*, said Lord Hugh Cecil.

It cannot be. The men disbanded from Navy, Army, and Air Force, to make room for the Socialist Bureaucracy and the conscientious objector, will be wanted again, and that soon. The day is swiftly coming when the country will be forced to choose between the dismemberment of the Empire and fighting for its existence. Mr. Lloyd George is running this country straight into war again.

A Degrading Traffic.

People are reluctant to believe evil of their rulers. Their rulers take advantage of that honest faith to impose upon the people. If righteousness exalteth a nation, how shall unrighteousness not debase it? Political corruption is one cause of the decay. It began with the Marconi scandal which went unpunished. It continued in a system of mendacity and illicit influence unparalleled since the Reform Act. The sale of honours has become so notorious that names and prices are openly quoted, and the profits amount to a handsome fortune. The existence of that secret hoard, available for every device of the unscrupulous politician, is a public danger. It is being used, and will be used, to continue the reign of the Coalition, which endows the Prime Minister and his Cabinet Secretariat with an autocracy fatal, and designedly fatal, to representative Government. There is nothing wrong in collecting a party fund; but to get money by selling honours and other benefits is infamous.

The Men Who Stand Fast.

There is in Parliament a body of men called the Die-Hards, which alone protests against the betrayal to the King's enemies of British rights, which alone stands for honesty in politics and the exposure of corruption. First of all, the Die-Hards demand clean administration.

That demand must appeal to every decent citizen; for not Liberal, nor Labour, nor Conservative can hope for peace, welfare, and prosperity under the rule of organised political corruption.

All over the country, indeed, the constituencies are asking the Die-Hards to organise meetings and to send speakers. These things cost money. It is for that reason we are asking for money. For although the Die-Hards are the core of the Conservative Party, and will be the Conservative Party of the future, they must have money with which to accomplish their task.

Therefore we appeal to all those who desire the restoration of political honesty to contribute to that cause. There are no honours to be purchased; there is nothing to buy, except honour; nothing to gain, except the chance of saving the country and the Empire ere it be too late.

All money contributions should be sent to the Editor, *Morning Post*, 346, Strand, W.C.2. Cheques to be crossed "Die-Hard Fund."

THE PATRIOT.

Copies of THE PATRIOT can be obtained either through the usual agents or direct from the publishers:

THE BOSWELL PRINTING & PUBLISHING CO., LTD.,
2, WHITEFRIARS STREET, LONDON, E.C.4.

Single Copies, 6d.; or 7d. post free.

Terms of Subscription:—

3 months, 7/6; 6 months, 15/-; One year, 30/-.

The Publishers can supply Vol. I, bound in cloth, 13 issues, complete with Supplements, at 15/-

Published by THE BOSWELL PRINTING AND PUBLISHING CO., LTD., 2, Whitefriars Street, London, E.C.4.
Printed by ST. CLEMENTS PRESS, LTD., Portugal Street, Kingsway, W.C.2.